

Comment on *Deterministic Single-Photon Source for Distributed Quantum Networking* by Kuhn, Hennrich, and Rempe

H. J. Kimble

Norman Bridge Laboratory of Physics 12-33
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, CA 91125 USA

A recent article [1] describes an experiment to generate single photons within the setting of cavity QED. The authors claim that “a sequence of single photons is emitted on demand” and that their results represent “the realization of an intrinsically reversible single-photon source.” Although their work is certainly an advance towards these goals, unfortunately the observational evidence reported in Ref. [1] does not support the principal claims of the demonstration of a deterministic source for single photons, nor of emission that is intrinsically reversible as is required for the transfer of quantum states over a network. The underlying difficulties are (1) the random arrival of atoms into the interaction region means that photons are emitted at random and not “on demand,” (2) the corresponding fluctuations in atom number lead to a photon stream that is super-Poissonian, and (3) the stochastic character of atomic trajectories through the cavity mode produces unknown variations in the amplitude and phase of the emitted field, so that the source is not “intrinsically reversible.”

I begin by examining the data presented in Figure 4 of Ref. [1], which displays the second-order intensity correlation function $g_{D_1, D_2}^{(2)}(\tau)$ for the cross-correlation of photoelectric counting events from two detectors (D_1, D_2) as a function of time separation τ . Somewhat surprisingly, $g_{D_1, D_2}^{(2)}(\tau) \geq 1$, and in particular, $g_{D_1, D_2}^{(2)}(0) \simeq 1$, so that the inferred photon statistics are *super-Poissonian* $\langle \Delta n^2 \rangle > \langle n \rangle$ [2]. This is in marked contrast to the behavior required for an “on-demand” single-photon source, for which $g^{(2)}(0) \simeq 0$ with *sub-Poissonian* photon statistics $\langle \Delta n^2 \rangle < \langle n \rangle$ [2]. The authors attribute this disparity to detection events other than those arising from photons emitted from the cavity. *However, I emphasize that $g_{D_1, D_2}^{(2)}(\tau)$ would maintain the same form as in Fig. 4 of Ref. [1] even if the “relatively large noise contribution” from background light were eliminated altogether.*

To illustrate this point, consider the well-studied system of resonance fluorescence from a single two-state atom for which the photon statistics are described by $g_A^{(2)}(\tau)$, with $g_A^{(2)}(0) = 0$ [2]. If observations are made not for a single atom but rather for an interaction volume with a stochastic variation in atom number N , the resulting intensity correlation function $g_{D_1, D_2}^{(2)}(\tau)$ is of a markedly different form, as illustrated in Figure 1. *Significantly, Figure 1 reproduces the essential characteristics*

of Figure 4 in Ref. [1], including that the light is super-Poissonian [4]. The commonality of these two figures arises because of fluctuations in the number of “source” atoms about which there is no independent knowledge. In this setting, the observation of sub-Poissonian *photon statistics* requires sub-Poissonian *atom statistics*, with $g_{D_1, D_2}^{(2)}(0) < 1$ in direct correspondence to the reduction $Q_A \equiv \frac{\langle \Delta N \rangle^2 - \bar{N}}{\bar{N}} < 0$ [3]. Strategies to achieve $Q_A < 0$ include conditional detection as employed in the original experiment of Short and Mandel [2, 5] and atom trapping within the cavity.

In addition to fluctuations in arrival time and atom number, the experiment of Ref. [1] suffers from a lack of atomic localization with respect to the spatially varying coupling coefficient $g(\vec{r})$ due to unknown atomic motion through the cavity mode. As a result, the output pulse shapes and phases for photon emissions vary in a random fashion and are not controllable [6]. For the parameters of Ref. [1], the transverse velocity of a typical atom carries it across distances $\pm \frac{\lambda}{4}$ along the cavity axis, leading to (random) variations $\sim \pm \frac{\pi}{2}$ in the phase of the emitted field. *Hence, photon emissions are*




FIG. 1: Intensity correlation function $g_{D_1, D_2}^{(2)}(\tau)$ versus time delay τ for the fluorescent light from a beam of atoms with average number $\bar{N} = 0.1$ atoms. The line at $g_{D_1, D_2}^{(2)}(\tau) = 1$ represents the Poisson limit for coherent light of the same mean counting rates at (D_1, D_2). Time delay τ is measured in units of the transit time t_0 . The generalized Rabi frequency $\Omega' t_0 = 25$ and transverse decay rate $\beta t_0 = 0.1$. The lower trace is for background to signal ratio = 0.5, while the upper trace has no background [3].

reversible only in the sense that the emitted field is returned to the very same atom that gave rise to the emission within a time short compared to the atomic transit time $t_0 \equiv \frac{2w_0}{v_z} \simeq 35\mu s$. Moreover, reversible transmission to a second atom-cavity system requires knowledge of the actual time of the initial emission, as well as an “event” ready atom at the remote location. Neither of these capabilities follows from the experiment reported in Ref. [1].



- [1] A. Kuhn, M. Hennrich, and G. Rempe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 067901 (2002).

- [2] *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics*, L. Mandel and E. Wolf (Cambridge University Press, 1995), Section 15.6.
 [3] H. J. Kimble, M. Dagenais, and L. Mandel, Phys. Rev. **A18**, 201 (1978), Eq. (31).
 [4] Remaining quantitative differences (e.g., around $\tau = 0$) could be resolved by a more detailed model for the internal atomic states and the pumping and recycling mechanisms.
 [5] Note that the flux of atoms through the cavity in Ref. [1] is completely asynchronous with respect to the driving lasers. Furthermore, the mean number of photoelectric events per atom per pumping cycle is $\sim 0.04 \ll 1$. This low efficiency and the high background rate severely limit any sub-Poissonian effect that might be observed via conditional atomic detection [2].
 [6] L.-M. Duan, A. Kuzmich, and H. J. Kimble, quant-ph/0208051.